

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 7, 2005. Claims 1, 2, 8-11, 20-22, 24, 28 and 34-49 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 24 and 28 are in independent form. Claims 1, 24 and 28 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1, 2, 8-11, 20-22, 24, 28 and 34-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,081,852 (*Baker*).

As shown above, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 24 and 28 in terms that more clearly define what they regard as their invention. Applicants submit that these amended independent claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is a data communication system. The system comprises a source node, one or more destination nodes and a controller. The source node is adapted to transfer object data, to obtain a reception capability of the respective destination node from the controller, to set a segment size in accordance with the reception capability of the respective destination node in order to divide the object data into one or more segments, to divide the object data into one or more segments in accordance with the segment size, and to transfer data in each segment from the source node to the one or more destination nodes via the logical connection. The one or more destination nodes are adapted to receive the object data transferred from the source node. The controller is adapted to control a logical connection between the source node and the one or more destination nodes. According to Claim 1, the reception capability of the respective destination includes a maximum payload size of an asynchronous packet.

Among other important features of Claim 1 is a controller adapted to control a logical connection between the source node and the one or more destination nodes so that the source node is adapted (a) to obtain a reception capability of the respective destination node from the controller, (b) to set a segment size in accordance with the reception capability of the respective destination node in order to divide the object data into one or more segments, (c) to divide the object data into one or more segments in accordance with the segment size, and (d) to transfer data in each segment from the source node to the one or more destination nodes via the logical connection, as recited in Claim 1.

Baker relates to a method and system for autonomously operating a PCI-serial bus interface device circuit of a packetized data communications interface device. The *Baker* system discusses an IEEE 1394 network through which a PC 12 is connected to peripheral devices 14. The *Baker* system uses a threshold (“high water mark”) to control the start of a transmission (column 18, lines 46-48; column 17, lines 60-63), and divides a packet of data into portions of different sizes and assigns those portions to different destination addresses (Column 22, lines 15-20). However, Applicants have found nothing in *Baker* that would teach or suggest a controller adapted to control a logical connection between the source node and the one or more destination nodes so that the source node is adapted (a) to obtain a reception capability of the respective destination node from the controller, (b) to set a segment size in accordance with the reception capability of the respective destination node in order to divide the object data into one or more segments, (c) to divide the object data into one or more segments in accordance with the segment size, and (d) to transfer data in each segment from the source node to the one or more destination nodes via the logical connection, as recited in Claim 1.

Independent Claims 24 and 28 are data communication method and data

communication apparatus claims respectively corresponding to system Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above, and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200